mitted.. ..(*Interruptions*) One second please...(*Interruptions*) It is not fair. (*Interruptions*) I am obliged that Shri Jaswant Singh took it on himself to respond to the point. But I see and you would have noticed yourself that there are many Members from various parties who still want to voice their voices.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Why do you not waid?

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: On Government side, it is not necessary to wait for everybody to speak, for the round to finish. I notice that Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan, whom you called, is on another subject. That is why I want to speak for a minute.

I would like to categorically say that the charge is that we have succumbed, but we have not. We have not voted along, at all, with the sanctions. We have abstrained. We had definitely discouraged. We had taken a very clear stand on the issue. We had abstained. We had made it clear that - as Shri Jaswant Singh Said - we wanted a level treatment on this. This is not the only case of terrorism that is there in the world or it is also not the only case where plans have been blown up on ground by terrorists. There have been other cases. Our country itself has been a victim. We have been in trouble over getting hold of terrorists who are in various countries, not just in Pakistan or in other countries. We had this issue raised; we had it discussed. Finally we decided to abstain as a matter of principle to point out that we disapprove this discriminatory attitude.

At the present moment, the detailed discussion on the subject is going to come up when the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs are going to be discussed. At that point the Ministry of External Affairs would come out with the full stand. If the Members wish to have a statement on the issue we can definitely have it. But I do not think it is necessary when the discussion on the Demands for Grants of Ministry of External Affairs is just round the corner. We can have the discussion at that time. Thank you.

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: Sir, there is a special news telecast, once in a week, from Delhi Doordarshan for the deaf and dumb. Unfortunately, 6 per cent of the people of Kerala are deaf and dumb, according to the Statistics collected by All Kerala Association of the Deaf. There is a request from this particular association to telecast similar programmes from Trivandrum Doordarshan also. Trivandrum Doordarshan has not come out with any kind of entertainment show for these physically retarded people, especially when these people are not mentally retarded people but are only physically retarded people. No step has been taken for the introduction of the news reading in Malayalam for the deaf and dumb people. And this telecast from Trivandrum Doordarshan needs the approval of the Central Ministry for the special news telecast. So, I urge upon the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to take necessary steps...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA(Cuttack): Sir, this is a very important issue and it should be discussed. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am also on a very important subject. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Then you don't call anybody. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not that. That Minister has also replied to it. Now, let her have her say.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): You follow the convention of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Acharia, Prof. Savithri Lakshmanan is on her legs.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN: I am going to conclude, Sir. My plea is that the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting

should take necessary steps to start the news programme for the deaf and dumb members from Trivandrum Doordarshan immediately.

I think the Reporters might have heard my voice. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Each political party will have a chance. We cannot call four or five Members only from one Pary.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is why I told you earlier itself that at One o'Clock the Zero Hour can also come to an end.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you make other speak also? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: ....to regulate the House it will be easier for you also. On an international issue if any Member mentions about any important issue, then all the political parties should also be allowed to speak. So on this Libya issue, once this has been referred to by Shri Shahabuddin and Jaswant Singhji also spoke, then the other parties should also mention about their view points. Then you can take up some other issues. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: After the mention about the deaf and dumb, I don't feel like speaking on that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is true that every political party on an important matter of national importance can also express an opinion.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I am in favour of not talking after that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I agree with that. When some of the people spok, even the Minister also....

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I told him not to respond.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: We requested Mr. Kumaramangalam not to respond.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is all right. Well in advance, anticipating your allegiance he has answered it. Secondly, you also want to express your opinion. It is all right, you want to express your opinion about Libya., you have got a chance. Now the question is, how long have we to sit under Zero Hour? Should we extend this?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: May I help you, Sir? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: One minute. I have been seeing a number of points being raised. Almost every Member wants to contribute some of his opinions for the betterment of this country. Therefore, there are so many people who want to speak. Now, this Zero Hour comes to an end at One o'Clock. Are we to extend it?(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: i do not want to speak on Libya. I am to speak on the procedure. The point is that when Shahabuddin Sahib raised it, then after that if you had taken up other matters, I would have no objection. But you have allowed two other Members also. People in the country would like to know what our Party did in the House. I don't like at all to speak in this House and if the Chair is not sensitive, I do not want to speak and the Minister also stood up and said something. Why should I speak on this issue now? I raised the point first in this House not to go along with USA to vote against Libya. I am happy that they did not go along with USA and nothing more than that. (*Interruptions*) Then I have to clarify this. I am totally against any country aiding and abetting terrorism. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Sudhit Sawant, are you on the same subject?

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT (Rajapur): No, Sir, I am on a different subject. Mrs. Malini

Bhattacharya has already spoken from their party. They have got a chance already.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly taken your seat. You will have a change.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA(Andaman and Nicobar Islands): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of procedure. What Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury said is correct that we can take up one item after the other. But since today you have allowed their side maximum, this side could not get much of a chance. You have followed a system what you thought was correct in your wisdom and from tomorrow onwards, you can take up the procedure as he suggested. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:It is not my idea, even the hon. Speaker also had suggested that such of those Members who want to speak during 'Zero Hour' can come to the office and give a notice before 10 o'Clock.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR (Mangalore): Sir, we have given the notice well before 10 o'Clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly hear me. We can take up a maximum of 10 items in a day and not beyond that. But, if many important items are discussed for hours together, virtually it breaks the conventions and the traditions of this House. If 10 items are taken and if every Member speaks for two or three minutes, then it would be over by 10 minutes to One o'clock and by that time, other subjects can be taken up. So, some sort of a system should be evolved. Even the hon. Speaker is trying his best to express what he feels about it and by this process, I think, a lot of Members will have dissatisfaction and it does not create a healthy atmosphere also.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Sir, I must say that the two bombings of the USA and French airliners are the most ghastly incidents that could happen. We also had our own experience of 'Kanishka'. We are totally opposed to this kind of terrorism or State aid to this kind of terrorism. This is our position. But, on this UN Security Council vote, we wanted our country not to go along with the USA, because they were trying to use the Security council to meet their own arrogant purpose. We are all for recovering the culprits of these bombings and severe punishment has to be given to them. If a country is aiding terrorism, there must be sanctions against that country, no doubt about it. But, the point is whether a fair procedure was followed on this issue and this is what India objected and I am happy for it. But the moral position demands that when you cannot support certain positions taken by certain countries, you cannot abstain but should oppose that. As Mr. Jaswant Singh said, cerrtain phrases are yesterday's phrases, certain people have given up their kind of lenses that they used to see the world through. But there are certain countries who have not reconciled to the changed situation. They want to have their domination over the world, that is the problem. The Cold War has ended, but in some minds it is still prevailing gradually hothing up. so, in order to uphold the dignity of institution of United Nations and the International Court of Justice in The Hauge and other neutral organisation, we demanded that this kind of unilateral imposition of the will of any particular country or a group of countries should not be allowed to take place in the changed world. This is the position of our party.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Sir, we do to support the stands that Libya has been taking on many issues and very recently, the Conference of Islamic countries which was held at the instance of Pakistan passed a resolution on the issue of Kashmir. My friend Mr. Shahabuddin said it very correctly. Mr. Jaswant Singh also said that India did not vote along with the UN sanctions and that is appreciated. But in the tense situation, in the present global situation, I wish him also to go one step forward. At present, they are not only as the BJP party but the main Opposition Party in the House. If the Government trembles, if the Government fumbles in the face of pressure, they must also add strength

to our national views. Libya had come to Delhi and expressed regret for its stand in the Islamic Conference. That is a welcome change. That is why, we want the Government of India to declare that we will not join the sanction against Libya, particularly when the matter is *sub judice*. It is pending in the International Court of Justice. In such a situation, the Government of India should say that it will not join the sanction. In voting, India remaining neutral as a leader of the Non-aligned world was a blunder. In future on many occasions, we require wider support. In our national interest, in the international interest and in the interest of justice also, the stand that had been taken was wrong. We have fumbled. That was a mistake. But we must not join the sanction imposed by the United States.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): The Libyan affair at the United Nations has to be viewed in two contexts. The first context is the issue of State terrorism. The second context is the sanction. So far as we are concerned, we are already suffering a great deal in this country because of State sponsored terrorism by Pakistan. We want to mobilise the opinion in the world over against State sponsored terrorism. We have to take notice of this and we could not possibly have opposed this Resolution.

So far as the sanctions are concerned, we are against the saction. Therefore, the only pragmatic policy that we could have adopted at the United Nations was to abstain. We have not gone along with the United States in this particular matter. I think, this needs to be clearly understood. We are against the State sponsored terrorism. We could not have opposed the Resolution and yet demanded support.

In this particular case, we have also to take notice of the fact that there are certain countries which have joined us in condemning State sponsored terrorism by Pakistan. I would like to add that so far as our country is concerned, according to my information, we have asked the United States, Britain and France and other countries to support our demand for extradition of the terrorists who are today receiving scour and protection in Pakistan.

One other point I would like to make is that I am rather distressed by the stand taken by my good friend, elder friend, Shri Yunus Saleem. He seems to have posed the issue as though the issue is between Muslims and non-Muslims. It is unfortunate.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: You are wrong. When Iran is a target, when Afghanistan is a target, they are not Arab countries What do you say about Afghanistan and Iran?

SHRI INDER JIT: We should view the issue coolly in our best national interest, according to me, we should to have abstained from this Resolution.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour): May I have a chance on Bofors?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This cannot be converted into a general discussion. There is a limit for it.

Actually, the House ought to have completed its unlisted business by one O'clock. We should have taken other subjects.

Since many people wanted to participate in the international affairs...

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I am not responsible for that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Each political party has contributed on this aspect.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I want to speak without interruptions for only two minutes.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Kindly hear me. If you want to extend the Zero Hour beyond one O'clock, is it a good precedent? Is it a good practice? ON Libya, if every individual wants to contributes, it will take hours together.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: I said, I wanted only tow minutes. I can make it one minute.

But I must have that one minute. I have been waiting here for the last on and-a-half hours.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Should it be extended for another one hour?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI AMAL DATTA: You allowed Shri George Fernandes to speak. I wanted only one minute. Why shall I not get that one minute? (*Interruptions*)

I want to say something. I want the Government either to confirm or deny it. It is very important issue arising our of yesterday's debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are many other important issues.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA(Andaman & Nicobar Islands): There are other important issues.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: It cannot be allowed.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Two questions were asked and we are told by several Ministers including the Prime Minister.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: You do not allow him. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Why can't you call them to order? I said that I want only one minute. Two questions could not be answered yesterday. What were the contents of the note and who passed on that note.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You wanted only one minute.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Everybody has got something.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: You have allowed me to speak. He can speak after me.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: Please stop. I have been called.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: He does not have that much of understanding.

SHRI AMAL DATTA: In yesterday's debate, two questions could not be answered from the treasure benches in spite of the fact that four Ministers including the Prime Minister spoke.

One was what was in the note, what are the contents of the note.

The second issue is who passed the note.

Today's papers contain both the informations. One information already Shri George Fernades has pointed out. It has come in Indian Express under the name of the Editor Mr. Prabhu Chawla himself. Therefore, you have to give it some credence.

Similarly, in this paper, the Business and Political Observer, it has come in the name of the Editor of the paper, Mr. Pritish Nandy a very well-known name. He said the persons are Hindujas and the reports to that effect are available in the Prime Minister's Office. They have come from RAW, our Indian Agency based in Zurich and Geneva. I would like the Government to go through this report and either deny or abdicate. That is all. All right. Thank you very much.

SHRI SUDHIR SAWANT: According to the newspaper report, India has entered into an agreement for purchase of artillery guns with America. These guns are of the calibre of Bofors. There is nothing wrong. The gun is good I reiterate.

But there are some issues which must be clarified about this deal.

The first is that, whether in this deal there is an agreement for licensed production.

The second is what is the cost of this gun when compared to other guns in the market.

The third is what is the agreement for technological transfer, whether there has been agreement at all.